

Meeting Report

Regarding:
EDF Energy Community Forum

Date:
15 September 2011

Attending:

Alan Beasley *Save Cannington Action Group*
 Doug Bamsey *Sedgemoor District Council*
 Keith Cattell *Mendip Society*
 Cecily Collingridge *Ashleigh Ave Residents Assoc*
 John Edney *Somerset County Council*
 Mike Fackrell *Cannington Primary School*
 Lesley Flash *West Hinkley Action Group*
 Sue Goss *West Somerset Council*
 David Harper *Bridgwater College*
 Stuart Hill *Bridgwater Bay Wild Fowl Association*
 Malcolm Hogg *Nether Stowey Parish Council*
 Trevor Howes *Civil Nuclear Constabulary*
 Tony Hurry *Somerset County Council*

Allan Jeffery *Stop Hinkley*
 Alyn Jones *Somerset County Council*
 Lynda Laird *Cannington Parish Council*
 Jenny Lawrence *Somerset Racial Equality Council*
 Peter Malim OBE *Stogursey Parish Council*
 Brian Payne *Environment Agency*
 Sarah Porter *Stringston Parish Council*
 Anthony Trollope-Bellew *Somerset County Council*
 Rodney Western *Wembdon Parish Council*
 Alan Ladd *Chairman*
 David Eccles *EDF Energy*
 Charles St George *PPS*
 Deb Campbell *PPS*

Item
<p>1. Welcome and Introduction</p> <p>Alan Ladd (AL) thanked attendees for coming, asked attendees to go round the table and introduce themselves and reminded them of the terms of reference of the Forum.</p>
<p>2. Minutes and Matters Arising</p> <p>AL ran through the minutes and matters arising from the last Community Forum meeting on 7 July 2011:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 1, item 2: AL advised that Tony Hurry (TH) would be presenting this item at the meeting • Page 3, item 4: David Eccles (DE) confirmed that an initial meeting had been held between EDFE's technical experts and Stogursey Parish Council to discuss the temporary jetty and a follow up meeting had been arranged. • Page 4, item 8: CSG would update the Forum later in the meeting on the registration of members. • Page 4, item 9: an email had been circulated to the Forum from the Environment Agency via Deb Campbell (DC) about environmental permit applications • Page 4, item 9: an organisation chart from Tony McNulty of the Office of Nuclear Regulation (ONR) was circulated to this meeting. <p>Allan Jeffery (AJ) asked DE to clarify how many workers from France would be working at HPC and what is meant by Tier 1 contractors? DE explained that a Tier 1 contractor has primary responsibility for undertaking the construction work and they in turn will engage sub-contractors. This means that Tier 1 contractors, rather than EDF Energy, would be responsible for employing most of the people working at HPC. In terms of the origin of the workforce, it is hoped that many workers will be local and EDF Energy had put a range of measures in place to maximise the number of local workers. However, some of the work will require specialised skills not available locally. It was not possible at this stage to give precise estimates of the origins of the workforce.</p> <p>Stuart Hill (SH) commented that he was pleased to see his request that the Forum avoid meeting on the</p>

Item

first Thursday of the month noted on the last minutes and he pointed out that this issue had been raised when the Forum was original formed. He asked for an undertaking that meetings in the first Thursday of the month would be avoided when setting dates for the future. AL stated that the dates of the next two scheduled meetings do not coincide with the BBAW meeting dates and that PPS would take this into account when setting the dates of the meetings for next year. **ACTION PPS**

3. Emergency procedures and evacuation plan

Tony Hurry (TH), a Senior Civil Contingencies Officer from Somerset County Council gave a presentation introducing himself and explaining the current Hinkley Point Off-site Nuclear Emergency Plan. This included the relationship between the off-site nuclear plan and the 3 sites; legislation & guidance; purpose of the plan; risk assessment and planning process; alert & notification chain; command, control & co-ordination; public protection countermeasures; public communication; warning & informing the public; response to the media & general public; radiation monitoring operations; recovery phases planning; liaison with DECC & DCLG; provision of technical advice and role of nuclear operator; emergency phase tasks; assistance from MoD & armed forces; health & safety of responders: finance; maintenance of records; plan implementation, maintenance & training; and exercises involving the Hinkley Point sites – see attached presentation. He then invited questions.

John Edney (JE) asked, given the tidal reach beside Hinkley Point, what the level of contamination in the sea might be in the event of a leak of radioactive material and how deep it would go? TH said he could not answer this as he was not an expert in this area. The Environment Agency (EA) has responsibility for this and it is taken on board during the monitoring process if an event occurred. JE asked, as the sea would contaminate in such an event, shouldn't it be considered high priority? TH said that in such an event monitoring would take place along the coastal strip; paths would be restricted and sea users asked to stay clear.

Keith Cattell (KH) said that it would have been helpful to have shown the 40km radius on the map in the handout to show the reservoirs and farms that would also need to take precautions in the event of an incident. TH said that the Food Standards Agency and EA have these and it is accounted for in the plan. It was important to concentrate on immediate area to begin with as recovery would need to start within hours in response to an emergency. Afternote: Appropriate Maps showing the 40 Km Zone have now been included in the Brief enclosed with the Minutes.

Lynda Laird (LL) asked how far the contamination could go? TH said that would depend on the weather, tides, etc.

Cecily Collingridge (CC) asked if TH could clarify whether REPIR is under review? TH said that it was under review. REPIR is based on international and European regulations but he was unable to comment further as he was not aware of the detail of the review. CC asked whether the review would impact on the emergency plan? TH said any changes would be passed down to them. CC asked how long the review would take. TH was unable to provide further information on the timetable as this was a national review outside of his area of expertise.

CC asked about transport and the potential terrorist threat at Bridgwater railway station. TH said that that was part of a national security review that was going on regarding safety. CC wanted it noted that it is a concern to Bridgwater residents who live near the station.

Malcolm Hogg (MH) pointed out that the terms of reference meant the CF were not there to discuss issues pertaining to nuclear matters. CC said her questioning was to do with emergency procedures but MH said that the emergency off-site plan had been in place for a number of years and the CF were not here to pull it apart.

Peter Mailim (PM) asked about the effect during the new build and if the campus goes ahead on the emergency plan? TH said that these issues had been discussed with EDF Energy during Stage 2 consultation. Workers would not be classed as members of the public so EDF Energy would be wholly responsible for them and would need to provide the procedures for the workforce.

PM said that physical evacuation of the workforce would affect the emergency plan for the local community. TH responded that that would form part of the overall emergency plan. PM asked if there was an intention to update the plan? Under the terms of REPIR the work force were not members of the public and it was for the construction company/applicant to provide appropriate plans for the safety

Item

of the work force. TH was unable to comment further due to interruption.

PM said that as there was only one road into and from the site that there must be a relationship between the EDF Energy's plans for their workforce and the emergency plan. TH said that the police would be responsible for the overall plan and that it would depend on wind direction as to whether an evacuation would have to take place.

Lesley Flash (LF) said that if the wind is blowing towards the hostel it would also be blowing towards Stogursey so the two things went hand in hand.

SH asked if the increase in population as a whole, from workers and their families, had been taken into consideration. TH said that any developments within 8km are covered by specific planning regulations and had to take into account the effect of any increase in local population on the emergency plan.. EDF Energy had looked at the increase in population as part of its proposals and it was not considered significant as most of the development is away from Hinkley Point. Where people are living in the community, they are included in normal emergency planning. The associated developments at HPC and Bridgwater had been taken into account.

Mike Fackerell (MF) asked at what stage the controls over planning would come into play. MH said they were in force now as there are already two power stations and significant in-coming population could affect the emergency plan.

CC asked what would happen if the roads were affected by severe weather? How would you be able to do monitoring and how would you be able to get the villagers out? TH said there were arrangements with local farmers with tractors, but the plan did rely on existing facilities. LF commented that the plan should then be updated.

CC said that if people couldn't evacuate then they would have to shelter. The plan relies on people being able to get to the site and for those living there to get out quickly. TH said that road clearing decisions would need to be made at the time. Part of the planning that takes place nationally takes into consideration roads infrastructure which in turn informs local planning.

Mike Short (MS) said that it was naïve to suggest the emergency plan is independent and should not be co-ordinated with transport plans. Alyn Jones (AJ) said the emergency plan is a base assessment of where we are at the moment and the Council is assessing what else needs to be done as part of the assessment of EDF's proposals. The Council was working with EDF Energy to ensure adequate arrangements are in place – this included transport, emergency routes, etc. Once this process is complete the Council will ensure that an appropriate emergency plan is in place.

AL thanked TH for presenting to the CF

4. Investigative and Site Preparation Works

Item

DE said that the site preparation works application had been approved by WSC on 28 July 2011, subject to conditions. 99 conditions were identified, 6 of which apply to reinstatement of the site if IPC approval is not given. Site preparation will be in phases: starting with barn demolition and fencing; followed by primary site establishment; earthworks; and finally, if required, reinstatement. The conditions cut in at each phase. Legal agreement was due to be signed imminently and EDF Energy was hoping West Somerset Council would issue the formal permission in next few weeks. EDF Energy hopes to start the works in October once remediation works are complete. Substantial sums of money have been identified to mitigate the impacts of the site preparation works.

JE asked how the conditions are being monitored and enforced by the Council and how this would be resourced.? DE said monitoring is required and EDF Energy will be providing resources to the Council for this process. AJ confirmed that West Somerset Council had identified this requirement in the package and would be ensuring proper monitoring and enforcement.

SH said the works will bring changes to public footpaths access. This could affect his organisation and he is still waiting to discuss armed access with the Civil Nuclear Constabulary. Trevor Howes (TH) offered to meet with SH separately to discuss. **ACTION TH - SH** Afternote: TH gave SH the CNC contact details after the meeting so SH can speak to them at some future date if wished or if he would like his group to have a presentation on the role of the CNC

AJ said discussions were taking place with the County Council and Stogursey Parish Council on the issue of public rights of way. The fencing will cause loss of footpaths, but discussions were underway with local landowners and an indicative plan for temporary paths was in preparation. There are issues about the coast path, which needed to be discussed with EDF Energy, but the Council was happy that a robust plan was in place to ensure that compensatory routes/paths would be in place. AJ offered to provide the information associated with the revised Rights of Way Network and would request that this information is issued by the Council's Public Rights of Way officer team. **ACTION AJ - SH**

CC asked about the condition regarding air monitoring at Shurton, when it would begin and how would baseline monitoring be assessed? DE was unable to answer at this stage as he was unaware of the detail, but Doug Bamsey (DB) said that as soon as formal agreement had been reached, the S106 agreement will become a public document. It was agreed that there should be a presentation at the next Forum meeting on the Section 106 obligations so members can understand and discuss them. **ACTION EDFE**

Sue Goss (SG) said local residents had been approached about the placement of monitoring stations but heard nothing since. DE said detailed conversations had taken place with number of people about siting monitoring equipment on their properties.. This issue would be discussed further at next Main Site Neighbourhood Forum (MSNF) meeting.

Mike Short (MS) said that baseline monitoring should be established before any works start on the site. DE said he was unsure how the monitoring process works in detail so was unable to respond. He suggested the subject could be discussed at a future MSNF meeting.

5. Transport Forum Meeting, 26 July 2011

DE provided a brief overview of the last Transport Forum meeting where the Junction 24 and Bridgwater highway improvement proposals were discussed as part of the formal consultation. He also said that discussions about improvements on the C182 are continuing.

DE said EDFE is in discussions with Cannington Parish Council about the proposals affecting the village and feedback is being collated and would be reported when the DCO application had been submitted. LL said that Cannington PC felt plans were not adequate and had asked EDFE to come back to them with adequate information. DE said a follow up meeting had been arranged on 29 September.

Discussion took place about submission of the DCO application, how it is being made available and if there would be a summary. CSG said that once DCO application submitted, IPC has 28 days to accept it, after which it becomes available to the public. AJ added that the local authorities will be asked to comment on adequacy of consultation so some information may be available to the public before then.

SH expressed that he hoped proper mitigation would be put in place for Combwich in respect of use of the wharf for loading/unloading.

6. Main Site Neighbourhood Forum

Item

An overview of August's meeting was given. The agenda included: a briefing on the jetty application; support schemes; the Enterprise Centre; and noise and air quality monitoring.

PM suggested having the jetty as an agenda item at the next Community Forum. The application was due to be considered at a public inquiry in mid-November, where the public are welcome to make comments and Stogursey Parish Council would be represented. It was agreed to have this item as a brief update at the next meeting as it looks like being a full agenda in November. **ACTION: EDFE**

The question of why the jetty was being included in the DCO application when an application had been made to the MMO was raised. DE said he would provide any afternote to the minutes to clarify why EDFE is doing this. **AFTERNOTE: EDF Energy is committed to seeking consent for the temporary jetty as a prior application ahead of its main DCO application. EDF Energy wants to begin construction of the temporary jetty as soon as possible, so that it can take traffic off the local road network at the earliest possible opportunity. EDF Energy submitted applications to the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) in December 2010 and they are due to be considered at a Public Inquiry beginning on 15 November 2011. EDF Energy considered removing the jetty provisions from the DCO, as proposed in the Stage 2 Update consultation, to avoid duplication. However, we subsequently concluded that it would be better to leave them in the DCO, so that we could pursue them via that route if the MMO does not grant consent for our applications. The temporary jetty is a key part of EDF Energy's plans to minimise the impact of the project on the local road network, and EDF Energy is committed to pursuing consent for the jetty as soon as possible.**

8. Forum Registration Update

CStG tabled a paper giving an update on the current status of membership registration and suggesting that those identified in the paper that have not yet returned their registration forms be sent a final reminder asking them to return the form by the end of September. If completed forms hadn't been returned by then, the organisation would be removed from the Forum membership list.

There was concern expressed that some groups may be unaware of this system and might be removed from the list despite a continued interest in the Forum.; This was a particular concern for those whose contact details were no longer correct. CStG pointed out that all the relevant groups that had not yet responded would be sent either an email or a letter and registration form to complete. PPS would make every effort to ensure that it had up-to-date contact details for all these organisations.. **ACTION: PPS**

Concern was also expressed about administration of the Forum and LF said that the representative organisation on her place name was still incorrect and should read WHAG. **ACTION: PPS**

9. Any Other Business

Item

Clarification was sought from Alan Beasley (AB) about whether asbestos removal had begun and whether EDF Energy had applied to extend the application for its removal. Brian Payne (BP) said the spoil mound was currently being treated and asbestos was being correctly stored on-site for removal at later date. AJ confirmed that an application to extension the working period to February 2012 had been received. Concern was expressed by m that the preliminary works could overlap with the asbestos works. AJ said there would be an cumulative assessment from EDF Energy as part of its application to extend the working period.

SG asked if the application for a nitrogen plant at Hinkley Point B station would be taken into consideration in this cumulative assessment. AJ said that it was the responsibility of the applicant, to take this into account.

LL asked if EDFE is using Roberts lorries as have received complaints from local residents in Cannington about their driving. DE asked LL to email him and agreed to look into it. **ACTION LL - EDFE**

SH asked if Combwich Wharf would be used for preliminary works. DE confirmed that it would not be used.

BP gave an update on environmental permits. The permit application for large water cooling discharges expected soon will have two stage of consultation, while the construction phase discharges will only have a one stage consultation reflecting its temporary and smaller nature.

BP wanted to make people aware that David Cameron, EA's Head of Media, would be contacting local parish councils to see if it would be possible to work with them on improving the EA's local consultation procedures.

10. Date of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Community Forum is Thursday, 17 November at Hinkley Point C Meeting Room (formerly the Hinkley Point Training Centre).

PPS to propose dates for next year's meetings and circulate with minutes. **AFTERNOTE:** dates proposed for Forum meetings next year are:

Thursday 16 February 2012

Thursday 10 May 2012

Thursday 13 September 2012

Thursday 13 December 2012